

REMARKS

Claims 23-96 are pending in the application.

Claims 23-96 have been rejected.

Claims 23, 37, 46, 55, 65, 73, 81, and 89 have been amended.

Claims 100-103 have been added. Support for these claims can be found at least in p. 42, l. 8 through p. 52, l. 6.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 23-96 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6, 722,216 issued to Ankireddipally et al. (“Ankireddipally”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0024497 listing Campbell et al. as inventors (“Campbell”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant has amended Claim 23. Claim 23 now states “pushing said message from said customer relations management system, wherein said pushing is performed in response to said receiving said incoming customer support request and identifying said agent to perform said incoming customer support request,” among other such distinctions. Support for this feature can be found in the specification, at least, in p. 41, II. 8-23 and Figures 1A and 3.

Applicant respectfully submits that Ankireddipally and Campbell, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest “pushing said message from said customer relations management system, wherein said pushing is performed in response to said receiving said incoming customer support request and identifying said agent to perform said incoming customer support request.” The cited sections of Ankireddipally disclose a CXIP

protocol that specifies message types that are exchanged between applications, semantics of the messages and exchange order. *See Ankireddipally, 7:1-17.* The cited sections of Campbell disclose a customer communication service system, an agent mapper, and a customer schedule manager. *See Campbell ¶¶ [0041], [0080], [0082].* Applicant respectfully submits that there is no motivation or suggestion to combine the teachings of Ankireddipally and Campbell to practice, among other limitations, the claimed pushing a message from a customer relations management system, at least because neither of the two references recognizes a need, or even the ability, to perform anything even remotely comparable to pushing a message from a customer relations management system. Campbell fails to recognize the need for pushing a message from a customer relations management system because Campbell's invention already comprises an agent mapper and customer schedule manager to service a customer communication to an agent. Ankireddipally also fails to recognize the need for pushing a message from said customer relations management system because Ankireddipally's invention is focused on exchanging data between applications and not on assigning requests to agents. Thus, the cited sections of Ankireddipally and Campbell, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a method of pushing said message from said customer relations management system. For at least these reasons Applicant respectfully submits the reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Applicant has similarly amended independent Claims 37, 46, 55, 65, 73, 81, and 89. Claims 37, 46, 55, 65, 73, 81, and 89 are allowable claims for similar reasons to Claim 23. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 24-36, 38-45, 47-54, 56-64, 66-72, 74-80, 82-88, and 90-96 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 23, 37, 46, 55, 65, 73, 81, and 89, which

have been amended. Similarly, newly added Claims 100-103 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 23, 37, 46, and 55, which have been amended. Since these independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinguishable, these dependent claims are similarly patentably distinguishable. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5094.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorize that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,



Ana G. Luther
Patent Agent for Applicant
Reg. No. 61,704
Telephone: (512) 439-5094
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099